RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
APR 22 2008

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 11 and 13 remain in this application. Claim 12 has been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn or added.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 11 and 13 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,662,365 on the basis that the conflicting claims are not identical, but not patentably distinct from each other.

Submitted herewith is a terminal disclaimer with respect to U.S. Patent No. 6,662,365, and therefore it is submitted that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1 through 11 and 13 is overcome.

Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeCarmo in view of Ward.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the requirements of claim 12 as originally presented, and therefore claim 1 requires that "the adjustable control parameters of the native parental control system include a first parental control scheme and a second parental control scheme, the first parental control scheme being incompatible with the second parental control scheme, and wherein the control programming allows a user to choose general control parameters of the first parental control scheme and the second parental control scheme."

With respect to claim 12, the rejection states:

> Regarding claim 12, when read in light of claim 1, DeCarmo further teaches the adjustable control parameters of the native parental control system include a first parental control scheme and a second parental control scheme, the first parental control scheme being incompatible with the second parental control scheme (column 2 lines 4-7 and lines 9-12 suggest DeCarmo's invention can be implemented with multiple devices having incompatible parental control schemes), and wherein the control programming allows a user to choose general control parameters of the first parental control scheme and the second parental control scheme (column 8 lines 5-10 show an example of how ratings manager 210 can adjust the parental control parameters of a device).

Looking to the cited portion of DeCarmo at col. 2, it states at lines 1 through 14 that:

> Limitations of the V-Chip technology as well as the above-referenced patent include being unable to handle picture-in-picture situations where each picture enforces a different rating system. Further, they are not compatible with input devices that have different parental control schemes, in example, digital video disc (DVD). Moreover, neither solution provides means for enforcing parental controls on devices without built-in parental enforcement.
>
> Accordingly, what is needed is a parental control method and system for multimedia displays that support differing technologies of parental enforcement as well as providing parental enforcement where none is available.

Here the discussion of "different rating systems" is understood to regard the ratings of different forms of media (e.g., a movie rating system vs. a TV program rating system), and not different threshold ratings for permitted viewing. The discussion of different and incompatible parental control schemes employed on different input devices does not disclose two parental control schemes, and it is submitted that the simple expression of a desire for "a parental control method and system for multimedia displays that support differing technologies of parental enforcement" (without more) does not disclose two parental control schemes in which the user is able to choose general control parameters of each of the incompatible control schemes.

Further, with respect to the requirement that "the control programming allows a user to choose general control parameters of the first parental control scheme and the second parental control scheme", the rejection cites DeCarmo at col. 8, lines 5 through 10, which states that:

> For example, if a DVD disc contains "PG-13" and "G" versions of the content and the DVD player was configured to enable PG-13 playback, it would send the PG-13 version. If ratings manager 210 had been configured for "G" content, ratings manager 210 would request that the G version be played instead of the PG-13 version.

However, this portion of the DeCarmo patent does not disclose choosing between first and second parental control schemes (particularly schemes that are incompatible), but merely discusses two alternative settings (e.g., "PG" programming or "G" programming) for the same user selected "acceptable content rating" for the ratings manager of DeCarmo. In other words, DeCarmo here discusses two optional settings for the same acceptable content rating for the ratings manager, rather than two different content ratings for the manager. In considering this discussion in DeCarmo, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that there are not two "parental control schemes" being described, but two different settings for the same user selected "acceptable content rating".

It is therefore submitted that the cited patents, and especially the allegedly obvious combination of DeCarmo and Ward set forth in the rejection of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claim 1. Further, claims 2 through 11 and 13, which depend from claim 1, also include the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 1 through 13 is therefore respectfully requested.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
APR 22 2008

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.

Date: APRIL 22, 2008

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
Customer No. **40,158**
P.O. Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357